

MEETING MINUTES FROM THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

April 7, 2004

Maricopa Association of Governments Office, Cholla Room  
302 North First Avenue  
Phoenix, Arizona

AGENCY MEMBERS

David Fern, Chandler	Keith Kesti, Peoria
Mark Weiner, Gilbert	Jeff Van Skike, Phoenix (St. Trans.)
Pat Thurman, Glendale	*Troy Hayes, Phoenix (Water)
David Ramirez, Goodyear	*Rod Ramos, Scottsdale
Ted Collins, MCDOT	Brett Huskey, Surprise
Steven Borst, MCESD	James Bond, Tempe
Doug Davis, Mesa	

ADVISORY MEMBERS

John Ashley, ACA	*Brian Gallimore, AGC
* Baird Fullerton, ACEC	*Peter Kandaris, SRP
Jeff Benedict, ARPA	Paul Nebeker, NUCA
Don Green, ARPA	*Tom Domizi, NUCA
* Jim Grose, AGC	

MAG ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Paul Ward

\* Members not attending or represented by proxy.

GUESTS/VISITORS

Robert Herz, MCDOT  
Jorge Garcia, Grabber Power Products  
Jim Anderson, Olson Precast of Arizona, Inc.  
Tommy R. Thomas, Ameron International

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:34 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

The members reviewed the March 3, 2004 meeting minutes and had no comments. Ted Collins introduced a motion for a vote on the minutes as written. David Fern seconded the motion. A voice vote of all ayes and no nays was recorded.

3. 2003 Carry Over Case:

- a. **Case 03-03 - Details 252, 253 & 254 - Bus Bays:** Ted Collins & Bob Herz submitted a revised case dated April 7, 2004. They reviewed all of the comments received on the Case for common ground and placed the common ground items in the revised detail. In a review of the detail by the committee, they had the following comments 1) The thickness of the PCC slab in the detail at the lower right corner (9") is not the same as the other details (8"). 2) There is a typo in Note 3 (preperation should be preparation).

4. 2004 New Cases

- a. **Case 04-01 - Detail 230 - Sidewalk:** Bob Herz discussed the reasoning for the case. Mark Weiner expressed concern for the space (right-of-way) available to install other improvements behind the sidewalk e.g., water meters, street lights, etc. The only options for Gilbert is to require a wider right-of-way and he did not think that the council will be favorable to the change.
- b. **Case 04-02 - Detail (new) - Handrails:** Ted Collins noted that the comments received on the case are under review. He should have a revised detail by next meeting. Jim Bond noted that a curb is required per ADA and some sort of a kick panel should be placed at the bottom between the posts. It was noted that when installed behind a head wall, the head wall is normally graded 2 inches above finish grade providing the curb.
- c. **Case 04-03 - Detail (new) - Sub-grade Drain:** Ted provided a revised Detail dated April 7, 2004. All comments were addressed in the revised Detail. The committee reviewed the Detail and had no comments.
- d. **Case 04-04 - Details 250, 260 and 262 - Driveway Entrances and Alley Entrance.** Ted is presently working on this case and was not ready to submit a revised Detail at this meeting. MCDOT is looking into the cross slope of the driveways and alley entrances. The slopes do not meet ADA requirements. He should have something ready by the next meeting.
- e. **Case 04-05A - Section 321.6.2 - Density and Case 04-05B - Section 315.3.3 - Bituminous Prime Coat:** Doug reviewed the two blooper/typo Cases. The committee had no comments.
- f. **Case 04-06 - Section 342 - Decorative Pavement and Detail 225 - Median Concrete Pavers:** David Fern provided new wording and a detail on the case. The committee provided a short review of the Detail and requested that 1) the welded wire mesh be replaced with small diameter rebar and 2) the angle iron be deleted.
- g. **Case 04-07 - Detail 404 - Water & Sanitary Sewer Separation Protection:** Steve Borst discussed some of the deficiencies in the Detail. The Detail does not use current materials. PCC encasement should not be used for new construction. Plastic type materials should not be used in any encasement. He asked the members if they know of any failure because of the Detail? If one occurred, he would like to know the particulars of the failure for his discussions with ADEQ. Since the last meeting, Steve had not addressed the changes with ADEQ. As noted in the meeting, ADEQ approval of the changes will be the key to the

case. Paul Nebeker noted that in Phoenix, the entire water line is required to be encased when crossing a service line.

5. New Cases:

- a. **Case 04-08 - Section 321.6.5 - Asphalt Cement Content & Section 321.6.6 - Air Voids:** Ted Collins submitted Case 04-08 to be considered by the Committee. After further review of the 2004 up-dates, MCDOT felt that further referencing is required to reduce or eliminate any confusion in corrective action between Section 321.6 and Section 710.
- b. **Case 04-09 - Section 758 - Reinforced Concrete Pressure Pipe - Steel Cylinder Type:** Pat Thurman submitted a changed in Section 758 to be considered by the Committee. Presently, Section 758 allows pipe sizes 16" diameter through 42" diameter. Pat has checked and could not locate the reason why the restriction was in the Specifications. His case will open the sizes to those allowable by AWWA. Tommy Thomas was asked on the manufacturing of the smaller sizes, he stated that economics will restrict or eliminate the use of smaller sizes.

6. General Discussion:

- a. Paul Nebeker asked if the agencies allow HDPE for storm sewer and if they require the pipe to be mandreled. The general consensus was that some agencies allow HDPE and require the mandreling of the pipe.
- b. Doug Davis and Steven Borst had a discussion regarding the certification of water and sewer installations. Steve stated that the County requires a registrant to seal the plans stating that the improvements were installed per plans or noted changes and that the improvements passed all applicable tests (pressure, leakage, bacteria, etc.) The registrant does not have to be the designer and more than one registrant can be accepted e.g., surveyor for installation, engineer for testing, etc. Doug asked for the form the County recommend to be signed. A discussion developed between the various agencies on how best to accomplish the request of the County with minimal administration work imposed on the Agency and the County.

6. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.